

Nov 5, 19

Dear Sylvia,

Just a brief additional comment on your letter to ~~Sh~~ Podhoretz re Bickel.

You say Frazier excludes 235-240 as frames during which Connally could have received his wounds from the TSBD. I differ with you on the literal interpretation of his testimony. Whatever his intention, to me he is saying that C could have been hit at some point during that time.

He says that in 235 C is facing ". . . too much towards the front", and that in ". . . 240 he is turned . . . too far to the right." The implication seems to be that at some point in this turn to his right, C was in position to take his wounds from the TSBD. (I, of course, don't agree he was hit from there, since his shoulder lurches forward -- towards the camera -- at 238, indicating in my opinion a shot from the left rear).

As further indication of Frazier's intention to raise such a possibility (of a hit 235-240), at the top of 5/170, he tells Specter: "There is only one position beyond frame 225 at which the Governor could have been struck . . .".

Specter, of course, doesn't ask him precisely where this point is. And Frazier himself doesn't make it any clearer on p. 171 when he again seems to be restricting the Connally shot to 207-225; but it appears to me he meant this as a TSBD Connally-shot possibility only as related to the double-hit hypothesis, and did not mean it as contradiction to his previous ". . . only one position beyond 225 . . .".

At any rate, I don't think we can correctly say that Frazier rules out a Connally shot at ~~any~~ <sup>some</sup> point between 235-240.

Penn will be in tomorrow to tape the Sahl show tomorrow night. Lane will be back for his third Sahl appearance next Sunday. I understand he also will be talking ~~xx~~ next weekend to an editors' meeting in San Diego, which sounded fairly important. Channel 7 (A.B.C.) on its nightly local news program (Baxter Ward) has been running Lane every week night for the past two weeks, followed by a rebuttal by Liebeler -- or sometimes, Ball. They taped an 1½ hour interview with Lane several weeks ago, and are showing it ~~bx~~ bit by bit. I feel the net effect is a big plus -- despite some Lane advocacy tactics which occasionally gives Liebeler an unnecessary handle.

Ramparts is selling like crazy here, as I'm sure it is all over. My neighborhood newsstand has sold almost 500 copies in two weeks, more than three times their previous monthly sale of 150. (they have even sold over 100 of R to J, which they had stacked on the sidewalk, and continue to do a good job with TMO, thanks primarily to Sahl). Ramparts, by the way, told Maggie they intend to apologize editorially next month for the Brackman-Levine abortion. Besides, we must admit it's the Penn Jones story and editorial comment that has made an impact; and not the

*review: Love, Ray*



If you think the anti-Cohen letter may warrant publication, could you please pass it along to Arnoni? And of course, I would appreciate your nailing any factual errors.

The tremendous impact of the Life article obviously moves us to a new stage. Those who are against a reopening are now giving up any pretense that the Report can be sustained on a factual basis, but insist instead that it be accepted on faith as being in the national interest.

This is unmistakably shown ~~in~~ in Rep. Carl Albert's asinine statement: ". . . no new evidence . . . no need . . . to investigate. . . I never did get excited about minor inconsistencies such as an extra bullet."

and in Connally's position; red-baiting the critics, saying a new investigation was not "warranted, justifiable, or desirable"; and that his disagreement re the separate shot "is only one little detail". Ha! We shall see.

At any rate, I do feel the dam is breaking, and we do have something to be thankful for this Thanksgiving -- so I wish you one, and a Happy Hanukah, as well.

Love,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Ray", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.